

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 424—COMMEMORATING THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEDICATION OF SHEPPARD AIR FORCE BASE AND THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CREATION OF THE EURO-NATO JOINT JET PILOT TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 424

Whereas, in 1940, Major General Rush B. Lincoln, Commandant of United States Army Air Corps Technical Schools, surveyed the sites surrounding the city of Wichita Falls, Texas for a future training school;

Whereas, 80 years ago, Sheppard Air Force Base began as Sheppard Field and opened as a United States Army Air Corps training facility on 300 acres of land in Wichita Falls, named after former United States Senator John Morris Sheppard;

Whereas, during World War II, Sheppard Field trained more than 44,000 mechanics and 445,000 basic trainees, playing a vital role in the development of airpower for defeating the Axis powers;

Whereas, after serving as an Army Air Force separation center following the end of World War II, Sheppard Field was inactivated in August of 1946;

Whereas, on August 1, 1948, Sheppard Field was reactivated by the Department of the Air Force to enhance basic training and was dedicated as Sheppard Air Force Base;

Whereas, by 1953, the base qualified more than 80,000 trained aircraft maintainers and served as the home for 2 percent of all airmen;

Whereas Sheppard Air Force Base adapted and matured alongside the United States Armed Forces by becoming the home of missile maintenance training in 1955;

Whereas, from 1959 to 1962, Sheppard Air Force Base hosted the 4245th Strategic Wing and, from 1962 to 1966, the 494th Bombardment Wing, directing aerial refueling and bombardment squadrons;

Whereas, in 1965, the 3630th Flying Training Wing was activated and in 1966 began providing pilot training to German Air Force students;

Whereas, in 1968, Sheppard Air Force Base became the epicenter for field training in the aircraft maintenance training pipeline, carried on today by the 982d Training Group, who deliver more than 35,000 trained students each year;

Whereas the 3630th Flying Training Wing became the 80th Flying Training Wing, expanding its student radius in 1973 to Iran, El Salvador, Ecuador, Saudi Arabia, and other nations under the security assistance program;

Whereas, in 1973, Sheppard Air Force Base held the honor of serving as a reception point for Operation Homecoming, welcoming home Vietnam prisoners of war after years of captivity;

Whereas, in 1981, at Sheppard Air Force Base, the 80th Flying Training Wing began the Euro-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training Program with 11 other partner nations (Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, and the United Kingdom), providing the partner nations with several domains of pilot training;

Whereas, on July 1, 1993, Sheppard Air Force Base became the home of all aircraft

maintenance training when the Sheppard Training Center became the 82nd Training Wing;

Whereas, in 2016, the Euro-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training Program added Romania as its 14th partner and was extended through 2026;

Whereas the Euro-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training Program remains the world's only internationally manned and managed flying training program;

Whereas, since 1981, the Euro-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training Program has delivered more than 7,800 combat pilots for its 14 partner nations in support of NATO;

Whereas the Euro-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training Program trains 50 percent of all United States Air Force fighter pilots and is the sole source of fighter pilots for the partner nations of Belgium, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, and Norway;

Whereas the 80th Flying Training Wing launches 50,000 sorties per year and is recognized as the busiest joint-use airfield in the Air Force;

Whereas, in fiscal year 2019, Sheppard Air Force Base created \$4,600,000,000 in economic impact and served as the region's largest employer, accounting for 1 in 8 jobs in Wichita County;

Whereas the 82nd Training Wing, stationed at Sheppard Air Force Base, graduates more than 60,000 officer and enlisted students each year;

Whereas the 82nd Training Wing is the largest technical training wing in the United States Air Force, teaching 6,000 students on a daily basis across the globe; and

Whereas, over the course of 80 years, Sheppard Air Force Base has delivered more than 7,000,000 trained Airmen, Soldiers, Sailors, Marines, and international partners and pilots to support military interoperability around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate commemorates the 80th anniversary of the opening of Sheppard Air Force Base and the 40th anniversary of the creation of the Euro-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training Program.

SENATE RESOLUTION 425—RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF PROTECTING FREEDOM OF SPEECH, THOUGHT, AND EXPRESSION AT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 425

Whereas the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States guarantees that "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech";

Whereas, in *Healy v. James*, 408 U.S. 169 (1972), the Supreme Court of the United States held that the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States applies in full force on the campuses of public colleges and universities;

Whereas, in *Widmar v. Vincent*, 454 U.S. 263 (1981), the Supreme Court of the United States observed that "the campus of a public university, at least for its students, possesses many of the characteristics of a public forum";

Whereas lower Federal courts have also held that the open, outdoor areas of the cam-

puses of public colleges and universities are public forums;

Whereas section 112(a)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011a(a)(2)) contains a sense of Congress noting that "an institution of higher education should facilitate the free and open exchange of ideas", "students should not be intimidated, harassed, discouraged from speaking out, or discriminated against", "students should be treated equally and fairly", and "nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to modify, change, or infringe upon any constitutionally protected religious liberty, freedom, expression, or association";

Whereas, despite the clarity of the applicable legal precedent and the vital importance of protecting public colleges in the United States as true "marketplaces of ideas", the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education has found that approximately 1 in 10 of the top colleges and universities in the United States quarantine student expression to so-called "free speech zones", and a survey of 466 schools found that almost 30 percent maintain severely restrictive speech codes that clearly and substantially prohibit constitutionally protected speech;

Whereas, according to the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), "Speech codes adopted by government-financed state colleges and universities amount to government censorship, in violation of the Constitution. And the ACLU believes that all campuses should adhere to First Amendment principles because academic freedom is a bedrock of education in a free society.";

Whereas the University of Chicago, as part of its commitment "to free and open inquiry in all matters", issued a statement in which "it guarantees all members of the University community the broadest possible latitude to speak, write, listen, challenge, and learn", and more than 50 university administrations and faculty bodies have endorsed a version of the "Chicago Statement";

Whereas, in December 2014, the University of Hawaii at Hilo settled a lawsuit for \$50,000 after it was sued in Federal court for prohibiting students from protesting the National Security Agency unless those students were standing in the tiny, flood-prone free speech zone at the university;

Whereas, in July 2015, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, settled a lawsuit for \$35,000 after it was sued in Federal court for prohibiting a student from handing out flyers about animal abuse outside of the free speech zone at the university, comprising less than 0.01 percent of campus;

Whereas, in May 2016, a student-plaintiff settled her lawsuit against Blinn College in Texas for \$50,000 after administrators told her she needed "special permission" to advocate for Second Amendment rights outside of the tiny free speech zone at the college;

Whereas, in February 2017, Georgia Gwinnett College agreed to modify its restrictive speech policies after two students sued in Federal court to challenge a requirement that students obtain prior authorization from administrators to engage in expressive activity within the limits of a tiny free speech zone, comprising less than 0.0015 percent of campus;

Whereas, in March 2017, Middlebury College students and protesters from the community prevented an invited speaker from giving his presentation and then attacked his car and assaulted a professor as the two attempted to leave, resulting in the professor suffering a concussion;

Whereas, in January 2018, Kellogg Community College in Michigan settled a lawsuit for \$55,000 for arresting two students for handing out copies of the Constitution of the United States while talking with their fellow students on a sidewalk;

Whereas, in June 2018, the University of Michigan agreed to change its restrictive speech code on the same day the United States Department of Justice filed a statement of interest in support of a lawsuit in Federal court challenging the constitutionality of the speech code of the university;

Whereas, in December 2018, the Los Angeles Community College District, a 9-campus community college district that includes Pierce College, settled a lawsuit for \$225,000 and changed its restrictive speech policies after it was sued in Federal court for prohibiting a Pierce College student from distributing Spanish-language copies of the Constitution of the United States on campus unless he stood in the free speech zone, which comprised approximately 0.003 percent of the total area of the 426 acres of the college;

Whereas, in December 2018, the University of California, Berkeley, home of the 1960s campus free speech movement, settled a lawsuit for \$70,000 and changed its restrictive policies after it was sued in Federal court for singling out one student group, apart from other student groups, with the imposition of stricter rules for inviting "high-profile" public speakers;

Whereas the States of Virginia, Missouri, Arizona, Kentucky, Colorado, Utah, North Carolina, Tennessee, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, South Dakota, and Iowa have passed legislation prohibiting public colleges and universities from quarantining expressive activities on the open outdoor areas of campuses to misleadingly labeled free speech zones; and

Whereas free speech zones have been used to restrict political speech from all parts of the political spectrum and have thus inhibited the free exchange of ideas at campuses across the country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that free speech zones and restrictive speech codes are inherently at odds with the freedom of speech guaranteed by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

(2) recognizes that institutions of higher education should facilitate and recommit themselves to protecting the free and open exchange of ideas;

(3) recognizes that freedom of expression and freedom of speech are sacred ideals of the United States that must be vigorously safeguarded in a world increasingly hostile to democracy;

(4) encourages the Secretary of Education to promote policies that foster spirited debate, academic freedom, intellectual curiosity, and viewpoint diversity on the campuses of public colleges and universities; and

(5) encourages the Attorney General to defend and protect the First Amendment across public colleges and universities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3863. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2792, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3864. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2792, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3865. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended

to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2792, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3866. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2792, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3863. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2792, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ REAUTHORIZATION OF SBIR AND STTR PROGRAMS.

(a) SBIR.—Section 9(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(m)) is amended by striking "September 30, 2022" and inserting "September 30, 2027".

(b) STTR.—Section 9(n)(1)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(n)(1)(A)) is amended by striking "2022" and inserting "2027".

SA 3864. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2792, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5 ____ PILOT PROGRAM ON ACTIVITIES UNDER THE TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR A REDUCTION IN SUICIDE AMONG VETERANS.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of providing the module described in subsection (b) and the services described in subsection (c) as part of the Transition Assistance Program for members of the Armed Forces participating in the Transition Assistance Program as a means of reducing the incidence of suicide among veterans.

(b) MODULE.—The module described in this subsection is a three-hour module under the Transition Assistance Program for each member of the Armed Forces participating in the pilot program that includes the following:

(1) An in-person meeting between the cohort of the member and a social worker or mental health provider in which the social worker or mental health provider—

(A) counsels the cohort on specific potential risks confronting members after discharge or release from the Armed Forces, including loss of community or a support system, isolation from family, friends, or society, identity crisis in the transition from military to civilian life, vulnerability viewed as a weakness, need for empathy, self-medication and addiction, importance of sleep and exercise, homelessness, and reasons why veterans attempt and complete suicide;

(B) in coordination with the inTransition program of the Department of Defense, counsels members of the cohort who have been diagnosed with physical, psychological, or neurological issues, such as post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, adverse childhood experiences, depression, and bipolar disorder, on—

(i) the potential risks for such members from such issues after discharge or release; and

(ii) the resources and treatment options afforded to members for such issues through the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Defense, and non-profit organizations;

(C) counsels the cohort about the resources afforded to victims of military sexual trauma through the Department of Veterans Affairs; and

(D) counsels the cohort about the manner in which members might experience grief during the transition from military to civilian life, and the resources afforded to them for grieving through the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(2) In coordination with the Solid Start program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, the provision to each cohort member of contact information for a counseling or other appropriate facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs in the locality in which such member intends to reside after discharge or release.

(3) The submittal by cohort members to the Department of Veterans Affairs (including both the Veterans Health Administration and the Veterans Benefits Administration) of their medical records in connection with service in the Armed Forces, whether or not such members intend to file a claim with the Department for benefits with respect to any service-connected disability.

(c) SERVICES.—The services described in this subsection in connection with the Transition Assistance Program for each member of the Armed Forces participating in the pilot program are the following:

(1) Not later than 90 days after the discharge or release of the member from the Armed Forces, a contact of the member by a social worker or behavioral health coordinator from the Department of Veterans Affairs to schedule a follow-up appointment with a social worker or behavioral health provider at the facility applicable to the member under subsection (b)(2) to occur not later than 90 days after such contact.

(2) During the appointment scheduled pursuant to paragraph (1)—

(A) an assessment of the member to determine the experiences of the member with events during service in the Armed Forces that could lead, whether individually or cumulatively, to physical, psychological, or neurological issues, including issues described in subsection (b)(1)(B); and

(B) the development of a medical treatment plan for the member, including treatment for issues identified pursuant to the assessment under subparagraph (A).

(d) LOCATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The pilot program shall be carried out at not fewer than 10 Transition Assistance Centers of the Department of Defense that serve not fewer than 300 members of the Armed Forces annually that are jointly selected by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for purposes of the pilot program.

(2) MEMBERS SERVED.—The centers selected under paragraph (1) shall, to the extent practicable, be centers that, whether individually or in aggregate, serve all the Armed Forces and both the regular and reserve components of the Armed Forces.

(e) SELECTION AND COMMENCEMENT.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of